



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,983	06/27/2006	Joan Davila Casitas	TJA-131US	7383
23122	7590	03/05/2010	EXAMINER	
RATNERPRESTIA			CULLER, JILL E	
P.O. BOX 980			ART UNIT	
VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482			PAPER NUMBER	
			2854	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			03/05/2010	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/563,983

Applicant(s)

DAVILA CASITAS ET AL.

Examiner

Jill E. Culler

Art Unit

2854

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 December 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-10, 13-17 and 22-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 11, 12 and 18-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 January 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20060109
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Species I, Sub-species A in the reply filed on December 30, 2009 is acknowledged. Claims 5-10, 13-17 and 22-24 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 18 and 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,521,561 to Pali et al.

With respect to claim 1, Pali et al. teaches a device for securing doctor blades to a printing roller doctor assembly of the type that comprises releasable securing means, 22, 23, for joining at least one longitudinal supporting portion of a doctor blade, 21, to a body of said doctor assembly, said doctor blade having a cantilevered free longitudinal portion, wherein said releasable securing means comprises at least one magnetic element configured and arranged to maintain a first face of said supporting portion of the at least one doctor blade in firm contact with a supporting surface of said body and a pressing element in firm contact with a second face of the supporting portion of the

doctor blade opposite to said first face in contact with the body, with the supporting portion of the doctor blade being trapped between said pressing element and said supporting surface of the body. See column 3, lines 52-60, column 4, lines 9-29 and Fig. 5.

With respect to claim 2, Pali et al. teaches that the at least one magnetic element is imbedded in the material of the body and has an active surface that is level with the supporting surface of the body and the pressing element includes a material attractable by the magnetic elements. See column 4, lines 9-29.

With respect to claim 3, although Pali et al. does not explicitly teach that the magnetic element is formed by at least one continuous strip imbedded in the material of the body along the length of the body, this is an obvious alternative to having a plurality of pieces, as taught by Pali et al. and therefore one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to use the continuous strip.

With respect to claim 4, Pali et al. teaches that the magnetic element is formed by a plurality of pieces imbedded in the material of the body and distributed along the length of the body. See column 4, lines 9-29.

With respect to claim 18, Pali et al. teaches that the pressing element is linked by one of its edges to the body by means of an articulation so that the pressing element can pivot between an open position and a securing position. See column 3, lines 52-60.

With respect to claim 20, Pali et al. teaches that the body comprises a configuration designed to cooperate with an edge of the doctor blade to place the doctor

blade in an operating position. See column 3, lines 52-60, column 4, lines 9-29 and Fig. 5.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pali et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,179,625 to Groden.

With respect to claims 11-12, Pali et al. teaches all that is claimed, as in the above rejection of claims 1-4, 18 and 20, except that the at least one magnetic element is linked to a mechanism configured and arranged to selectively move the magnetic element between a resting position, in which the magnetic force of the magnetic element is attenuated or cancelled, and an operating position, in which the magnetic force of the magnetic element acts on the doctor blade and on the material attractable by the magnetic element included in the pressing element, wherein, in said resting position, the cited active surface of the magnetic element is sunken below and away from the supporting surface of the body, while in said operating position, the cited active surface of the magnetic element is level with the supporting surface of the body.

Groden teaches a magnetic element, 10, contained in a body, M, linked to a mechanism configured and arranged to arranged to selectively move the magnetic

element between a resting position, in which the magnetic force of the magnetic element is attenuated or cancelled, and an operating position, in which the magnetic force of the magnetic element acts on material attractable by the magnetic element, wherein, in said resting position, the cited active surface of the magnetic element is sunken below and away from the supporting surface of the body, while in said operating position, the cited active surface of the magnetic element is level with the supporting surface of the body. See page 1, column 2, lines 39-55, page 2, column 1, lines 25-33, page 2, column 2, lines 12-51 and Fig. 2.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the apparatus of Pali et al. to include a mechanism for moving the magnetic element, as taught by Groden, in order to readily change the strength of the magnetic attraction when changing the doctor blade.

Claims 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pali et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,027,513 to Allison, Jr.

With respect to claim 19, Pali et al. teaches all that is claimed, as in the above rejection of claims 1-4, 18 and 20, except that said pressing element is independent of the body, and the body comprises a configuration designed to cooperate with an edge of the pressing element to place the pressing element in an operating position.

Allison, Jr. teaches a device for securing doctor blades, 16, to a printing roller doctor assembly having a pressing element, 34, which is independent of the body, 30, and the body comprises a configuration designed to cooperate with an edge of the

pressing element to place the pressing element in an operating position. See column 2, lines 37-59 and Fig. 1.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the apparatus of Pali et al. to have the pressing element independent of the body, as taught by Allison, Jr. in order to provide a more convenient opening for inserting the doctor blade.

With respect to claim 21, Pali et al. teaches all that is claimed, as in the above rejection of claims 1-4, 18 and 20, except the doctor blade is made of a non-magnetic or paramagnetic material or is not attractable by a magnetic element, since Pali et al. is silent with respect to the material of the doctor blade.

Allison, Jr. teaches standard doctor blades made of plastic. See column 2, lines 30-36 and column 3, lines 1-5.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the apparatus of Pali et al. to have the doctor blade made of a non-magnetic material, because Allison, Jr. teaches this is a standard material for doctor blades.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jill E. Culler whose telephone number is (571)272-2159. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:00-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

jec

/Jill E. Culler/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2854